



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,113	12/15/2003	Woei Ling Leow	P03,0495 (H0005960 US)	3645
7590 05/02/2008 HONEY WELL INTERNATIONAL INC. Law Dept. AB2 P.O. Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-9806				
EXAMINER				
NEGRON, WANDA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2622				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,113

Applicant(s)

LEOW ET AL.

Examiner

WANDA M. NEGRON

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13, 15-27 and 29-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13, 15-27 and 29-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the supplemental appeal brief filed on February 12, 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 10, 13-22, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiore et al. (WO 02/082275 A1), hereinafter referred to as Fiore, in view of Ogawa et al. (US 5,857,044), hereinafter referred to as Ogawa.

Regarding **claim 1**, Fiore discloses a surveillance system, i.e. a monitoring system (see paragraph [0018]) comprising a camera, i.e. a video signal source (6) (see paragraph [0038]), arranged to output images of a protected area, an input device, e.g. an external event source (8), arranged to provide a data annotation, e.g. information associated with the occurrence of an external event (see paragraph [0054]), and, a server (20) arranged to synchronously store the images and the data annotation so that the data annotation can be used to search for a segment of the images (see paragraphs [0054] and [0057]). In addition, Fiore discloses that the server is arranged to time stamp the data annotation (see paragraphs [0048] and [0054]). Fiore, however, does not explicitly teach comparing the time stamp of the data annotation to an image count when searching for the segment of the images.

The concept of obtaining a frame number, i.e. an image count, from a time code, i.e. a timestamp, is old and well known in the art, as evidenced by Ogawa (see col. 5, lines 26 – 40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare a timestamp with an image count, i.e. to calculate an image count from an associated timestamp and compare said image count to the image count of the relevant image segment, since a person with ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp if

this leads to an anticipated result, e.g., to find a relevant image segment by searching for an specific frame number.

Regarding **claim 4**, Fiore in view of Ogawa discloses that the server is arranged to cause the segment of the images matching the time stamp to be displayed, i.e. providing the retrieved portion to an output apparatus (see paragraph [0057], lines 7-11).

Regarding **claim 10**, Fiore in view of Ogawa discloses that the camera comprises a video camera (see paragraph [0038]), and wherein the server comprises a video server, i.e. a server for storing video signals and its associated data (see paragraph [0038], lines 7-9).

Method **claims 13, 15-22, 25-27, and 29-31** are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 1 and 4. Therefore method claims 13, 15-22, 25-27, and 29-31 correspond to apparatus claims 1 and 4 and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

Claims 5-8, 23, 24, 32-34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiore in view of Ogawa as applied to claims 1-4, 10, 13-22, and 25-31 above, and further in view of Brown et al. (WO 01/13637 A1), hereinafter referred to as Brown.

Regarding **claim 5**, as mentioned in the discussion of claim 1 above, Fiore in view of Ogawa discloses all the limitations of the parent claim. Fiore in view of Ogawa, however, does not teach that the server is arranged to save the data annotation in SQL readable form.

Brown, on the other hand, discloses that the video server database is implemented using SQL (see page 47, lines 14-15), which is a standardized computer language to create, retrieve, update or delete data from a relational database.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the database of the video server taught by Fiore in view of Ogawa using SQL, as described by Brown, because the system would have been easier to create, update and maintain since SQL is such a well-known computer query language.

Regarding **claim 6**, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses that the server is arranged to time stamp the data annotation (see Fiore, paragraphs [0048] and [0054]).

Regarding **claim 7**, it would be inherent to arrange the server of Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown to receive an SQL search string corresponding to the data annotation since the video server database is implemented using SQL. In addition, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses the use of a string search to retrieve the

data annotation, i.e. an event type, an event description, etc. (see Brown, page 73, lines 7-23, and figures 46 and 47).

Regarding **claim 8**, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses that the server is arranged to match the data annotation found as a result of the search to the segment of the images (see Brown, page 73, lines 7-23, and figures 46 and 47).

Regarding **claim 9**, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses that the server is arranged to match the time stamp of the data annotation to an image count when searching for the segment of the images (see Fiore, paragraph [0057] and claim 9).

Method **claims 23-24 and 32-33** are drawn to the method of using the corresponding apparatus claimed in claims 5-9. Therefore method claims 13-22 and 25-31 correspond to apparatus claims 5-9 and are rejected for the same reasons of obviousness as used above.

Regarding **claim 34**, as mentioned above, Fiore in view of Ogawa discloses all the limitations of the parent claim. Fiore in view of Ogawa, however, does not explicitly teach that the link comprises a data attribute stamp wherein the data attribute serves as an index to retrieve video and data segments of the same characteristic inferred by the data attribute.

On the other hand, Brown discloses that the link comprises a data attribute stamp, interpreted as a searchable recording criteria other than date or time, wherein the data attribute serves as an index to retrieve video and data segments of the same characteristic inferred by the data attribute (see page 73, lines 7-23, and figures 46 and 47).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a data attribute for indexing associated video and data segments as taught by Brown in the method disclosed by Fiore in view of Ogawa since doing so would enable the user to search for information associated with an event even if she is unaware of the exact instance when the event occurred.

Regarding **claim 36**, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses that the data attribute comprises luminosity, i.e. an event type associated with drastic changes in brightness (see Fiore, paragraphs [0044], lines 4-6).

Regarding **claim 37**, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses that the data attribute comprises a biometric signature, i.e. an event type associated with identification of an individual using image recognition (see Brown, page 23, lines 14-21).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiore in view of Ogawa as applied to claims 1-4, 10, 13-22, and 25-31 above.

and further in view of Arazi et al. (US 6,330,025 B1), hereinafter referred to as Arazi.

Regarding **claim 11**, as mentioned in the discussion of claim 1 above, Fiore in view of Ogawa discloses all the limitations of the parent claim. Fiore in view of Ogawa, however, does not teach that that the camera comprises an IR camera.

Arazi, on the other hand, teaches the use of a forward-looking IR camera (54). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an IR camera, as disclosed by Arazi, as a video signal input in the system disclosed by Fiore in view of Ogawa since the use of an IR camera provides a monitoring function even in low-light environments.

Regarding **claim 12**, as mentioned in the discussion of claim 1 above, Fiore in view of Ogawa discloses all the limitations of the parent claim. Fiore in view of Ogawa, however, does not teach that that the camera comprises a thermal imager.

Arazi, on the other hand, teaches the use of a forward-looking IR camera (54), which inherently is a thermal imager. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a forward-looking IR camera, as taught by Arazi, as a video signal input in the system disclosed by Fiore in view of Ogawa since the use of such a thermal imager provides a monitoring function even in low-light environments.

**Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown, and further in view of Arazi.**

Regarding **claim 35**, as mentioned above, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown discloses all the limitations of the parent claim. However, Fiore in view of Ogawa and Brown does not disclose that the data attribute comprises temperature.

Arazi, on the other hand, teaches that the data attribute comprises temperature, i.e. an event type associated with changes in heat signatures (see col. 7, lines 20-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use temperature as a data attribute because drastic changes in heat provide a monitoring function even in low-light environments.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wanda M. Negrón whose telephone number is (571) 270-1129. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 am - 4:00 pm alternate Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Wanda M. Negrón/
Examiner, AU 2622
April 27, 2008

/David L. Ometz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2622